

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached drawing sheet 1/3 includes changes to Figure 1, which provides depiction of the two respective angles of incidence θ_1 and $-\theta_1$ relative to an optical axis of the primary mirror, as recited in the claims. This sheet replaces original Figure 1, original drawing sheet 1/3.

Attachment: Replacement sheet 1/3.

REMARKS

The above amendments and following remarks are responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed April 26, 2005. Upon entry of the above amendments, Claims 1 and 4-6 will have been amended, Claims 2, 3, and 7 will have been canceled, new Claim 8 will have been added, and Claims 1, 4-6, and 8 will be pending. No new matter has been introduced. Entry and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Response to the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, “as failing to comply with the written description requirement.” The Examiner urges that this rejection is based upon features added in the claims in the previously filed Amendment, which are not described in the specification so as to reasonable convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor had possession thereof.

Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph.

Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, is moot and should be withdrawn.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 3,781,552 to Kadrmas. Applicant traverses these rejections.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite an observation device that includes the limitations discussed by the Examiner in Item 12, *Allowable Subject Matter*, Pages 5 and 6, of the April 26, 2005 non-final Office Action, as it relates to “the claim combination in claim 3.” Likewise, Claim 4 has been amended by placing Claim 4 in independent form that also includes the limitations discussed by the Examiner in Item 12 of the April 26, 2005 non-final Office Action, as it relates to “the claim combination of claim 4.” As such, the subject matter recited in Claims 1 and 4 are distinguished over the disclosure of Kadrmas. Claims 5, 6, and 8, which depend from either of Claims 1 or 4, are likewise distinguished over the disclosure of Kadrmas.

Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Response to the Objection of the Drawings

The drawings have been objected to on the basis that “[t]he incident angles are referred to the primary mirror and should be indicated on the drawings with respect to the primary mirror.”

Applicant has amended Figure 1, i.e., drawing sheet 1/3, to include the two respective angles of incident θ_1 and $-\theta_1$ relative to the primary mirror. As referred to above, the attached drawing sheet 1/3 replace original Figure 1. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings is now moot and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-7 are in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for filing this response to restriction requirement to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 3401-4025.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: September 21, 2005

By: 

Brian W. Brown

Registration No. 47,265

(202) 857-7887 Telephone

(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Three World Financial Center

New York, New York 10281-2101

(212) 415-8700 Telephone

(212) 415-8701 Facsimile